UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/551,033	09/27/2005	Takanori Saito	33082M277	4029
	7590 03/19/200 BRELL & RUSSELL	EXAMINER		
1130 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W., SUITE 1130			WILSON, GREGORY A	
WASHINGTO	WASHINGTON, DC 20036		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3749	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/19/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/551,033	SAITO ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Gregory A. Wilson	3749
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailir earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 F</u> 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowated closed in accordance with the practice under	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) <u>5-14</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) <u>5-14</u> is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examination 10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>25 September 2005</u> is/Applicant may not request that any objection to the	awn from consideration. or election requirement. er. /are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected or by the constant of the constant	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E		, ,
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applicationity documents have been received au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/4/08.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gat (6,727,474) in view of Kato (6,403,927). With regard to claims 5, 7 and 10, Gat discloses a thermal processing unit (10) for conducting a thermal process to a plurality of objects (14) in a tier like manner (Figure 1) in a processing container (12) made of metal (column 5, line 38-40) and includes a heating unit (36), a cooling gas introducing unit (18, 19) having a plurality of blowing holes formed in the pipe wall for blowing out the gas and is inserted into the container in a vertical direction (height) with the blowing holes formed at suitable intervals in the vertical direction of the pipe, a circular space (within element 33) formed between the container and the plurality of objects to be processed and furthermore includes a processing container (16) which a coolant flows. While Gat appears to anticipate the applicants invention in terms of function in that it provides a cooling gas pipe structure having multiple (unlabeled) blow holes, the applicant has amended the claims in an attempt to distinguish over the prior art reference by more clearly defining the direction in which the blow holes face, which allow for cooling gas to flow in a circumferential direction. While Gat appears to have blow holes that face in the radial direction when looking at Figure 1, the specification

Application/Control Number: 10/551,033

Page 3

Art Unit: 3749

does not teach a specific orientation of the blow holes. Additionally, upon further inspection of Figure 1, the spray nozzle (19) shows an unnumbered bottom hole which appears to have a different orientation than the other holes. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the orientation as being such that the gas will discharge tangentially or circumferentially. While it can be concluded that the spray nozzle of Gat is intended to allow for dispersement of gas flow through the plurality of openings, emphasis on the direction in which the gas flow is dispersed is not particularly conclusive. To modify the spray nozzle of Gat, such that the holes are oriented to induce a tangential or circumferential flow would solve the design need of rapidly and more uniformly cooling an object, the fact that it would have been obvious to try any number of nozzle orientations to achieve this desired result might show that a person having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious under 35 U.S.C 103 (KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.) to modify the gas nozzles of Gat such that gas flow is dispersed tangentially out of the pipe. With regard to claims 6, 8, 9 and 11-14, Gat discloses the applicants primary inventive concept as stated above, but with regard to claim 6, Gat does not particularly teach a plurality of cooling-gas introducing pipes. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to increase the amount of cooling-gas introducing pipes since increasing the amount of essential working parts does not appear to solve any stated problem in a new or unexpected way or is for any particular purpose which would be unobvious to one having ordinary skill in the art. With regard to claims 9 and 11, Gat does not particularly disclose the volume of the structure nor the rate at which gas is introduced to achieve the cooling as specified

in claim 11, however it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the flow rate of the gas flow as well as the volume of the container to meet the desired need, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in prior art, discovering the optimum or workable range involves only routine skill in the art. With regard to claims 8, Gat discloses the applicants primary inventive concept, but does not describe the blowing holes as having a porous member. The applicant discloses in the specification (See page 11, line 9-17) that the function of the porous member is to reduce the flow rate of the cooling gas blown out from the holes. While Gat does not particularly teach this feature, Kato teaches the use of valves (16) connected to individual air flow channels for the purpose of controlling the flow rate of cooling gas. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the valves of Kato into the invention of Gat (specifically the cooling gas introducing unit 18, 19) for the purpose of controlling the flow therethrough since the valves of Kato serves as a functional equivalent to the applicants "porous member".

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory A. Wilson whose telephone number is (571)272-4882. The examiner can normally be reached on 7 am - 4:30 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve McAllister can be reached on (571) 272-6785. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/551,033 Page 5

Art Unit: 3749

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Gregory A. Wilson/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3749 March 14, 2008